Ham-Policy Digest   Thu, 2 Dec 93   Volume 93 : Issue 504

Today's Topics:
                              ROBERT
                WHOA! Beavis, this SUCKS!!! (2 msgs)

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 30 Nov 1993 08:07:01 EDT
From: munnari.oz.au!bruce.cs.monash.edu.au!harbinger.cc.monash.edu.au!msuinfo!
uwm.edu!psuvax1!psuvm!ucf1vm!sta20051@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ROBERT
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

   I have finally figured ROBERT out. He favors the elimination
of all code requirements for amateur radio.

           1)   He is an Extra Class licensee so he must have passed
                the highest speed morse tests required for ham radio.

           2)   He _claims_ to favor retaining code requirements in
                order to filter the idiots out of the hobby.

           3)   He demonstrates with his postings that this does not
                work.

           4)   His arguments tend do denigrate the arguments of all
                the pro-code posters. This tactic is extremely
                effective in making the pro-code argument itsself

look as stupid as ROBERT attempts to look.

    By making the pro-code argument look so stupid, he actually makes
the no-code argument look like an excellent opportunity to clean
up the bands and improve amateur radio. (Let's make a special
sub band for coded licensees and limit thier access to that portion
of the spectrum exclusively.)
    I personally favor retaining the code requirements, but ROBERT makes
that position look rather silly doesn't he?

    This ROBERT is not a dumb as he looks.

-- STA

Date: 1 Dec 93 23:57:05 GMT
From: ogicse!cs.uoregon.edu!sgiblab!eddie.mit.edu!news.mtholyoke.edu!world!
dts@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: WHOA! Beavis, this SUCKS!!!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Dec1.142953.6617@cs.brown.edu> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael
P. Deignan) writes:
>rlt@cbnewsl.cb.att.com (r l taylor) writes:
>
>> How about having a VE session at the school, either after-hours or on
>> a weekend?
>
>The problem we've found is that many schools in the local area have
>very strict policies regarding non-school-related access to the
>facilities, due to various liability clauses written into their
>insurance contracts.
>
>
>> But they'd
>> be shit-outta-luck if the 2 General class hams came to give the test while
>> they were in English class, now wouldn't they? Or if you couldn't find
>> two General class hams who were willing to take time off from work to give
>> the exam?
>
>The specific case I am referring to is a 45-minute science class. I know
>several general-class-and-above hams, such as myself, who would gladly take
>time out of work to go and give a test during this time period. Of course,
>we can't anymore...

Ummm, you HAVE applied for your VE tags, haven't you? Generals are allowed

as VE's now, as part of the same ruling that got rid of the 2 generals thing.

>[stuff deleted]
--

Daniel Senie   Internet: dts@world.std.com
Daniel Senie Consulting   n1jeb@world.std.com
508-365-5352   Compuserve: 74176,1347

Date: 1 Dec 93 23:53:42 GMT
From: ogicse!cs.uoregon.edu!sgiblab!eddie.mit.edu!news.mtholyoke.edu!world!
dts@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: WHOA! Beavis, this SUCKS!!!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Nov30.173927.26626@cs.brown.edu> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu
(Michael P. Deignan) writes:
>robert@amanda.jpunix.com (Robert) writes:
>
>> The Novice license was brought into the VE program to counter widespread
>> abuse of the examinations. It was a sensible move.
>
>I disagree. It was an assinine move. I know local teachers who teach their
>student morse code as a science project.
>
>Now the kids want to go and take their "official" 5 wpm
>code test. Guess what? They can't. No school trips on weekends. Liability
>issues. Ad naeseaum.
>
>Bring a VE team to the school, you say? Sorry, VE test sessions have to be
>announced in advanced, and are "open to the public" according to rules.

5 Minutes before the examination, you get on a local repeater, and ask if
anyone wants to come and partake of a VE session. There you have advertised
the session. That is ALL IT TAKES. You're reading a lot more into the
advertising rule than is required.

>Since school officials clearly won't let anyone walk in during school
>hours to take a test, that is not an option either.
>
>Instead, it would have made sense just to have two general-class VE's
>give the test, but gee, we can't do that anymore, can we?
>
>
>Not to mention if you are a 12-year old kid who lives in the middle

```
>of Arizona, I guess you're shit-outta-luck too, huh?
>
>
>
>> Why not standardize
>> everything under the VEC program?
>
>For one reason, the VEC program is inefficient and adds unnecessary
>processing time to the licensing system. My wife's Novice paperwork,
>mailed directly to Gettysburg, was processed in three weeks. She had
>her license in under a month. Compared to 8-to-10 weeks for the VEC
>system. Bah!
>
>MD
>--
>-- Michael P. Deignan
>-- Population Studies & Training Center
>-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI  02912
>-- (401) 863-7284


--
------------------------------------------------------------------
Daniel Senie                    Internet:    dts@world.std.com
Daniel Senie Consulting                      n1jeb@world.std.com
508-365-5352                    Compuserve:  74176,1347

------------------------------

Date: Wed, 01 Dec 1993 00:32:33 GMT
From: bruce.cs.monash.edu.au!harbinger.cc.monash.edu.au!yeshua.marcam.com!
news.kei.com!eff!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!csn!yuma!
lobo.rmh.pr1.k12.co.us!@@munnari.oz.au
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Nov24.192018.10920@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<RZeiDc1w165w@mystis.wariat.org>, <1993Nov26.201238.27920@Csli.Stanford.EDU>et.ins
Subject : Re: This is a hobby not a

In article <1993Nov26.201238.27920@Csli.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csli.Stanford.EDU
(Paul Flaherty) writes:
>dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV) writes:
>
>>HA!, our packet system is child's play compared to what GE and Motorola
>>are doing. God, we think 2400 baud is FAST!
>
>While ham packet may not be technologically cutting edge, it has been an
>outstanding proof of concept experiment.  Moreover, packet has been a classic
```

```
>example of the innovation that hams do best -- high tech at low cost.  And,
>if you look at the "applied technology" aspect of it, we come off even better;
>the autoforwarding BBS system, which not exactly a new concept, has gone
>international to an extent that few others have.  The DX spotting networks.
>And of course, Phil's Most Excellent Bits.
>
>A number of projects exist which are driving the technology beyond 1200 baud
>FSK (way beyond it, in fact).
>
>>And now those pushing the edge of amateur radio packet (a good percentage
>>anyway) are tech's without code.
>
>Some substantiation of this would be nice.  From a personal and anecdotal
>experience, everyone I know of who's doing R&D work in this field has
>at least an Advanced, and most have an Extra.
>
>
>
>--
>-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies.  Bomber pilots make
>->paulf@Stanford.EDU   |   history."  -- Jake Grafton
```

And, don't forget the stories about american troops in the Gulf War who used
amateur packet TNCs and laptops for communications during the Desert Shield
and Desert Storm operations in 1990 and 1991!

Seems to me that says something about recent contributions by the amateur
world, eh?

Ron - W0OSK

Date: Tue, 30 Nov 1993 21:55:26 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!bruce.cs.monash.edu.au!harbinger.cc.monash.edu.au!
yeshua.marcam.com!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!kd4nc!
ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CH80KD.LEy@freenet.carleton.ca>,
<1993Nov29.144931.25358@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<1993Nov29.200556.2070@Csli.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Japanese no-code on HF

In article <1993Nov29.200556.2070@Csli.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csli.Stanford.EDU (Paul
Flaherty) writes:
>gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

```
>
>>I disagree. If we have two stations in contact over a given path
>>and one increases his power 10 db, the other will see a 10 db increase
>>in received signal strength.
>
>While it's true that higher signal strenth causes deeper penetration into the
>Heaviside layer, the practical effect of this is increase the strength of the
>reradiated signal, and as Gary says, increase the received signal strength.
>There may be some second order nonlinearlities, but their effects are small.

The second order effects occur when there is a large enough photonic
flux to change the ionospheric free electron density by heating effects.
This isn't a consideration at amateur power levels, though it begins to
be detectable at multi-megawatt power levels.

The ionosphere isn't perfectly ionized, and the free electron density
is not infinite, so the odds of a given photon interacting with a free
electron increase with the distance travelled through the ionosphere.
These odds are the same for every photon. The most likely average
distance is the "height of the layer" at that particular time, but note
well that some photons travel further while others travel less far.
Now if we increase the flux of photons by raising the power, the same
statistics apply. So the same percentage of photons will be refracted
from the same height as in the lower power case. The difference is that
because there are more photons, a higher flux, a higher *power*, there
will be a larger *absolute* number of photons which will travel each
distance than in the low power case. But since the statistical relation is
the same, the receiver still sees the same relative increase in photons
impinging on the receiving antenna.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV          | Where my job's going,  | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | I don't know. It might | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way             | wind up in Mexico.     | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244     |          -NAFTA Blues  |

------------------------------

Date: Wed, 1 Dec 93 23:07:15 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CHBBzq.9HJ@cup.hp.com>, <1993Nov30.170535.1622@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<CHCBJL.8xM@walter.bellcore.com>
Subject : Re: W5YI's coverage of "temporary callsigns"

In article <CHCBJL.8xM@walter.bellcore.com>,
```

sohl,william h <whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com> wrote:
>There's no immediate way to verify any newly issued call sign. The
>callbooks are immediately out-of-date relative to newly issued
>callsigns, the CD-Rom versions of the same are minimally several
>months old also. So, unless you plan on calling the FCC to validate
>any newly issued ham callsign you hear on the air, but can't find
>in the usually reference sources, then the argument that claims verification
>is a problem is of no validity to the discussion.

Surprise: We've done exactly that, in the case of a new ham who we thought was
a jammer as well. Calling the FCC is no big deal.

An FCC-issued callsign is accountable. One of these temporaries is not.

>So what's your solution to allow immediate on the air capability
>to those that pass the requirements?

None. However, the problem the FCC is claiming is that they're getting lots of
phone calls about folks who want to know where their license is. Cutting the
time lag down to the order of two weeks - easily possible - will fix their
problem.

>Improved processing isn't likely to ever result in anything less than a month's
>turnaround.

Sure it is: make it possible for the VEC to forward the application
electronically and produce the license within a few days of that, and voila!
you've done it.

The biggest delay in the current system is that the 610s must sit in a stack
until one part-time data entry clerk can get to them. _THAT_ is the cause of
6-10 week delays.
--
Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
    "The road to Usenet is littered with dead horses." -- Jack Hamilton

----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #504
****
****